

REMARKS

Claims 4-11, 13, 14, 16-25, 29, and 31 are pending.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested for the following reasons.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 4-9, 13, 14, 16-18, 22-25, and 30 under 35 USC § 102(a) for being anticipated by the Conrad patent. This rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Claim 4 recites a method for monitoring operation of a spacecraft by retrieving telemetry data from a storage device, processing the telemetry data, and making the processed telemetry data accessible on a network. At least said processing and making steps are automatically performed in response to a request received from a customer or technician and the request is received through the network. In addition to these features, claim 4 recites “automatically creating an accounting record in response to said request, said accounting record indicating a cost of downloading the processed telemetry data to the customer or technician from said internet website.” The Conrad patent does not teach or suggest these features.

The Conrad patent discloses downloading telemetered satellite data to a satellite user through a network such as the internet. Conrad further discloses that this data may be real-time data or archived data. Conrad, however, does not disclose or suggest automatically creating an accounting record in response to a user request, where the accounting record indicates a cost of downloading the processed telemetry data to the customer or technician from said internet website.

In rejecting claim 4, the Examiner relied on column 6, lines 5-6 and lines 30-47 of the Conrad patent. Here, Conrad discloses that a Network Management Center 140 schedules requests and sets of commands from satellite users, and that if the commands call for data to be transmitted back to earth then the time when the data is ready and the time to retrieve the data “are all taken into *account*.” Use of the word “account” here does not refer to computing a downloading cost or any other cost associated with accessing the telemetered data. Rather, this word refers to scheduling of transmissions that must be synchronized in order for specific ground stations to be able to receive the data from the satellite based on satellite orbital positions. This is further made clear at lines 35-44, where Conrad discusses the positions the satellites must be in in relation to the horizon in order for data to be received.

Because the Conrad patent does not disclose automatically creating an accounting record in response to a user request, where the accounting record indicates a cost of downloading the processed telemetry data to the customer or technician from said internet website, it is respectfully submitted that the Conrad patent cannot anticipate claim 4. Applicants further submit that these differences are sufficient to render claim 4 and its dependent claims non-obvious and thus patentable over Conrad.

Claim 13 recites a system for monitoring operation of a spacecraft. The system includes a storage device for storing telemetry data, a processor for processing the telemetry data, and a communications module which makes the processed telemetry data accessible on a network. The processor controls the communications module to automatically send the processed telemetry data through the network in response to an electronic request. In addition to these features, claim

13 recites that “the electronic request is formulated through customer activation of a hyperlink on a network website.” (See, for example, page 11 of the specification for support). The Conrad patent does not disclose these features.

The Conrad patent generally discloses allowing a satellite user to access telemetry data over an internet connection using a web browser. This data is accessed by the user sending commands through the connection. (See column 4, lines 46-57). In order to use a command-drive system such as Conrad, the user must have a predetermined knowledge of the commands. This increases the complexity of use of the overall system, which is inconvenient from the user’s standpoint. Claim 13, on the other hand, recites that the request is formulated through a hyperlink on a network website. This reduces the complexity of formulating a data request, thereby improving the efficiency of accessing data.

The Conrad patent does not disclose using a hyperlink to allow users to formulate data requests. Based on these differences, it is respectfully submitted that claim 13 and its dependent claims are allowable.

Claim 14 recites that the processor automatically creates an accounting record in response to said request, said accounting record indicating a cost of sending the processed telemetry data through the network. As previously discussed, the Conrad patent does not disclose these features. Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 14 and its dependent claims are allowable.

Claim 16 recites a system for monitoring operation of a spacecraft. The system includes a storage device for storing telemetry data, a processor “for automatically processing the telemetry data in response to detection of a customer logon onto a network site,” and a communications

module which makes the processed telemetry data accessible on the network site. The network site is password protected. The Conrad patent does not disclose the above-quoted features (see, for example, page 16 of the specification for support) of claim 16. Based on these differences, it is respectfully submitted that claim 16 and its dependent claims are allowable.

Claim 22 recites a method for providing an interactive website which relates to spacecraft operation. The method includes displaying a list of selectable parameters on said website which provides an indication of data relating to spacecraft operation, and receiving a request from a user indicating one or more parameters selected from the list. The method further includes retrieving data corresponding to the selected parameters from a storage device in response to said request; and processing said data retrieved in said retrieving step. (See, e.g., Figure 5 for support).

The Conrad patent fails to disclose at least the above-underlined features of claim 22, e.g., Conrad only discloses that a satellite user or owner sends a series of commands to a Network Management Center for requesting data from a satellite. Conrad does not disclose displaying the parameter list of claim 22 or any of the features attendant thereto. Based on at least these differences, it is respectfully submitted that claim 22 and its dependent claims are allowable.

Claim 23 recites that the request of claim 22 is made “by a user selecting said hyperlink.” Conrad does not disclose or suggest these features.

Claim 24 recites that “the parameters on the list are displayed as selectable icons.” Conrad does not disclose or suggest these features.

Claim 25 recites that the request is “made by a user selecting one or more of said icons.” Conrad does not disclose or suggest these features.

The Examiner rejected claims 10, 11, 19, 20, and 31 under 35 USC § 102(a) for being anticipated by the Moriguchi publication. This rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Claim 10 recites a method for monitoring operation of a spacecraft. The method includes automatically retrieving telemetry data based on a customer request; processing the telemetry data; and making the processed telemetry data accessible to the customer on a network, wherein said telemetry data includes helix current data for said spacecraft. Moriguchi does not disclose these features.

Moriguchi discloses transmitting helix current data from a satellite amplifier. Once the data is received by an earth station, a user analyzes the data. Moriguchi, therefore, discloses a conventional non-automated type of system discussed at length in the Background of the Invention section of Applicants’ specification, and which the invention represents a significant improvement over. Moriguchi does not disclose automatically retrieving telemetry data based on a customer request, processing the telemetry data; and then making the processed telemetry data accessible to the customer on a network, wherein said telemetry data includes helix current data for said spacecraft.

Absent these features, it is respectfully submitted that Moriguchi can neither anticipate nor render obvious the invention defined in claim 10.

Claim 11 recites automatically generating a graph of said helix current data over a predetermined period of time in response to logon by the customer on a network site. The Moriguchi patent does not disclose or suggest these features. It is therefore respectfully submitted that claim 11 is allowable, not only by virtue of its dependency from claim 10 but also based on the features separately recited therein.

Claim 19 recites a system for monitoring operation of a spacecraft. The system includes a storage device for storing telemetry data, a processor for processing the telemetry data, and a communications module which makes the processed telemetry data accessible on a network in response to a customer request, wherein said telemetry data includes helix current data for said spacecraft. The Moriguchi patent does not disclose these features, nor does it disclose a processor which generates a graph of said helix current data over a predetermined period of time as recited in claim 20. Applicants respectfully submitted that claims 19 and 20 are allowable for at least these reasons.

Claim 31 recites making the telemetry data accessible on a network on a real-time basis, wherein said telemetry data includes helix current data for said spacecraft. Moriguchi merely discloses telemetering helix current data from a satellite. It does not disclose making that data accessible on a network, let alone doing so in real-time. Based on these differences, it is respectfully submitted that claim 31 is allowable.

The Examiner rejected claim 29 under 35 USC § 103(a) based on a combination of Conrad and Moriguchi.

Claim 29 recites displaying a list of selectable parameters on said website which provides an indication of data relating to spacecraft operation, receiving a request from a user indicating one or more parameters selected from the list, and retrieving data corresponding to the selected parameters from a storage device in response to said request. As previously discussed, Conrad does not teach or suggest these features, and neither does the Moriguchi publication. Claim 29 further recites processing said data retrieved in said retrieving step, wherein said operation data includes helix current data for said spacecraft. While Moriguchi discloses downloading helix current data from a satellite, neither cited reference teaches or suggests making this type of data network-accessible to customers. Based on these differences, it is respectfully submitted that claim 29 is allowable over a Conrad-Moriguchi combination.

In view of the forgoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

To the extent necessary, Applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. §1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please

Serial No. 10/023,892

Docket No. SESA-0001

credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Samuel W. Ntiros', written over a horizontal line.

Samuel W. Ntiros
Registration No. 39,318

Carl R. Wesolowski
Registration No. 40,372

FLESHNER & KIM, LLP
P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
Phone: 703 766-3746
Fax: 703 766-3644

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610